

The Global Justice Game: Coordinator's Manual©

William A. Gamson, Boston College

Draft: June 26, 2007

Case: **Race to the Bottom**

Table of Contents:

Set-Up and Introduction	pp. 2-4
Running a Short Version of the Game	p. 5
Coordinators' Role During Play Of The Game	pp. 6-8
Scoring and Post-Game Discussion	pp. 9-12
Coordinator Evaluation Form	p. 13
Appendix: Going Bananas	pp. 14-15
Appendix: Example of a Summary of Results	pp. 16-20
Scoring Sheets	(separate document, not included)

This manual assumes that you are familiar with the material in the Participant's Manual. It provides the additional information you need to run the game and conduct the debriefing in which most of the actual learning takes place.

SET-UP

*** Each participant should have a *name tag* with the team they represent prominently displayed and space for the participant to add his or her own name as well.

The ideal physical space consists of the following:

*** A large room with 10-14 small tables (seating 2-5 people).

*** A set of 2 or 3 conference rooms off the large room, at least one with a table large enough to accommodate about a dozen people plus observers.

*** Each of the small tables with a name plate identifying the team whom the particular participants are representing.

*** (Optional) The small tables should be divided into clusters:

Cluster One: WTO, U.S. State Department, Poquita Banana

Cluster Two: European Union, HAZMAT

Cluster Three: Government of Plantanogway, PPM

Cluster Four: CLR, Interfaith Coalition, RA-RA

Cluster Five: WUSA, EuroPress, Liberation Press

You are unlikely to have such ideal space available, so you should try to adapt your actual space to get as close to it as possible. For example, in a class room with moveable chairs but no tables, you can rearrange the chairs into small circles for each team and try to save one section of the room for meetings which may require a larger circle. The teams can be arranged in the clusters suggested above to ease communication during the negotiation phase of the game. Having one or more extra rooms available allows for additional flexibility.

SINGLE CASE VERSUS MULTIPLE CASES

The game is designed so that the coordinator can run only one of the cases or several of them. There are strong advantages in running multiple cases, including:

*** In representing any particular team, the participants are encouraged to look at the global system from the perspective of that particular team. But the object of the game is to get participants to take a perspective that transcends the parochial view of any particular team. By having the same participants represent different types of teams in different cases, they are moved toward this broader perspective.

*** Each of the cases raises a different set of globalization issues – sweatshops, debt crises, intellectual property concerns, bio-piracy, consumerism, etc. Any single case is necessarily incomplete.

*** The capstone case, Making a Better World, can be played most effectively by participants after they have played several specific cases.

Since each case takes 3-4 hours as a minimum, running multiple cases requires either a semester long course format or a 3-5 day workshop. The course format is ideal since it allows for relevant reading, papers, and discussion beyond the actual playing of the game.

Playing a single case is still a stimulating learning experience for participants and different scenarios allow the coordinator to pick a case that is especially appropriate for a particular course or social action group. The post-game discussion is especially crucial in such circumstances since this is the point when participants are asked to step back from the perspective of their particular team and adopt a more transcendental perspective on global issues.

ABRIDGING THE RESOURCE KIT

The Resource Kit provided has materials relevant for the entire set of 7 scenarios. In running any particular scenario, you may wish to prepare an abridged edition to have copies available during the session for players to consult. You can do this by eliminating parts that are not relevant for particular scenarios.

For **Race to the Bottom** eliminate the following sections:

Notes and References for the following teams: A-Team, CDI, Fabrikistan, Banglabush, Progressive Caucus, AFL-CIO, Louisiana Support Network, Women's Global Alliance, BPM, FIJ, Islamic Labor Forum, Voice of Islam.

Eliminate the following sections: A-Team Special Programs, SAPs, IMF Governance, TRIP Agreements, WHO, Ecotourism, CERD, Political Islam, Capital Controls, Restoration of Communal Lands, ATCA.

ASSIGNING PARTICIPANTS TO TEAMS

Ideally, you should assign the participants to teams before they convene to play the game, allowing them to read over the Participant's Manual and the Portfolio for their team in advance. You may use (a) random assignment, or (b) placing participants on teams that support their perspective, or (c) placing people on teams that give them an unfamiliar perspective. We strongly recommend the last method if you have sufficient information on the participants to implement it. Giving people an unfamiliar perspective pushes them to understand the worldview of groups with whom they are not necessarily sympathetic and perhaps even regard as an enemy. Such an exercise often proves to be a valuable learning experience for participants. If the game is being used as part of an activist workshop, it gives the participants a better understanding of how their adversaries think and why they act as they do. Such knowledge is helpful in designing one's own action strategies to bring about change.

The A-Team and WTO teams are the most demanding in terms of needed sophistication and might be overwhelming for some participants. If the participants play more than one case of the game, you should make sure that you rotate them among teams, giving them as many different perspectives as possible over the course of several cases.

Having multiple participants for each role is desirable but not absolutely necessary. The game is designed to have teams deliberate and think through their action options before deciding and the internal interaction within teams is an important part of the learning experience. However, it can be run with some teams represented by a single participant.

Assigning Participants

Each participant should have a copy of the Participant's Manual and the portfolio for his or her particular team. Resource Kits, preferably abridged for the particular scenario, should be available during the game for reference.

Set up for different numbers of participants: Approximate range: 15-75.

First 14: WTO (2), other 12 teams, one person each.

15-27. Assign people in the following order: WTO, WUSA, EuroPress, Government of Plantanogway, European Union, U.S. State Department, HAZMAT, Poquita, PPM, CLR, Interfaith Coalition, RA-RA, Liberation Press.

28-40. Follow same order as #15-27 above.

41-53. Follow same order as #15-27 above

54-66. Follow same order as #15-27 above

67-79. Follow same order as #15-27 above

RUNNING A SHORT VERSION

The game emphasizes globalization issues as both disputes about policies and a contest over meaning and framing. It is possible, but not recommended, to run a short version of a case in about two hours by eliminating those aspects of the game that emphasize the contest over the framing of globalization issues. One simply eliminates the three journalist teams and the phases involving the press conferences and broadcasts. In this version, the game ends with Phase Three when the players reach their action decisions. The coordinator will also need time to calculate the results before proceeding with the post-game discussion.

COORDINATORS' ROLE DURING PLAY OF THE GAME

Assistance.

A coordinator, especially one running the game for the first time, would be well advised to seek one or more fellow coordinators or assistants. This makes it easier to keep track of things and to divide up some of the tasks. It is also helpful to be able to talk things over and make collective judgments where required in calculating team scores, using the scoring sheets discussed below.

Preparation.

You should have on hand the following:

- *** A clipboard.
- *** A stapler to clip together Action Forms and Broadcast Rating Forms that have two or more pages for some teams.
- *** A way of copying the Press Releases so that you can distribute a copy to each of the journalist teams. (This is optional since the journalists will have heard a press conference presenting it but a paper copy is a big help for the journalist teams in preparing their broadcasts.)

During Play

General: The role of the coordinator is not to direct play but to facilitate it. Don't try to micro-manage player activities, discussion, or action decisions. Instead, step back and let players move the scenario in their own direction, within the constraints provided by the rules. (Sometimes, however, particular teams will seem to be stuck and the coordinator may want to make a tentative suggestion or two to get them started.) During much of the game, your role will be simply:

- *** To move the players along when a phase is nearing completion
- *** To answer questions about ambiguities in the rules.
- *** To make sure that participants understand what they are supposed to be doing in each phase of the game.
- *** To observe and take notes.

Scoring

The set of Scoring Sheets are a separate document that you will need to calculate the results after the teams hand in their Action Forms at the end of Phase Three and their Broadcast Forms at the end of Phase Five.

Phase One: **Strategic Planning**. (Suggested length: 30-50 minutes)

Your role: observe and answer questions.

Phase Two: **Meeting and Negotiation** (suggested length: 50-75 minutes)

Observe and answer questions. During this phase, questions may come up concerning action options not explicitly included in the team portfolio. You may need to make a decision on whether such actions would be possible in the real world. This decision should be based on whether the equivalent team in the real world *could* take such action, not on whether it *would* take such action.

Phase Three: **Action Decisions** (suggested length: 30-50 minutes)

At the beginning of this phase, you should remind all non-journalist teams that they can either allow or exclude journalists as observers except for those journalist teams that have automatic access.

Because the action choices of many of the teams are contingent on what the WTO, A-Team, or other international body decides, it is desirable to provide some sequencing of when teams must decide. This will vary from case to case, but for **Race to the Bottom**, we suggest the following:

*** The WTO panels must announce their action choices at least 15 minutes before the end of the session. This should be simply an announcement of the final decision without explanation or justifications. They will have an opportunity to explain their decision in the next phase with a press release and press conference.

*** Other groups must fill out their action forms at the end of this phase.

The Coordinators should make sure they have collected one action form for each team at the end of Phase Three.

Phase Four: **Press Conferences** (30-50 minutes).

If there is no break between Phase Three and Phase Four, then the coordinators do not need to do anything except to introduce the various teams for press conferences in the order specified in the Participant's Manual. They should then carry out the calculation of results described below at a later time.

If there is a break, then the Coordinators can use the time to calculate the semi-final results using the Scoring Sheets. Since there are often actions other than those specified in the Scoring Sheets, this involves some judgment calls and one should allow a couple of hours for the task, using the following steps:

*** Using the action forms, prepare a summary of the actions taken by the various teams. See Appendix A for an example.

*** Go through the Scoring Sheets team by team, checking off the action choices taken by each team and circling the relevant values under the success indicators. This is also an opportunity to put question marks next to those values that seem questionable to you.

*** Calculate the semi-final results for each team on their success indicators, rounding values to the nearest integer. Note that the final results will be incomplete, pending the results from the Broadcast phase.

*** Prepare an explanation of the scores, summarizing how each team's results were affected by various actions. See Appendix A for an example.

Phase Five: **Broadcasts** (30-50 minutes)

There needs to be a pause between Phase Four and Phase Five so that the journalist teams have an opportunity to prepare their broadcast. At a minimum, this could be a luncheon or dinner break, but ideally it should be a couple of days to a week.

If there is a short pause between these phases, then you should dispense with calculating the semi-final results and include the Broadcast Rating Forms in calculating the final results. The summary of actions taken, team scores, and an explanation of why they went up or down needs to be prepared before the Post-Game discussion.

If there is a longer pause between Phase Four and Five and the Post-Game discussion will begin right after the end of Phase Five, then you will need to have calculated the semi-final scores in advance. This will enable you to add in results from the broadcast rating forms quickly to calculate a final score for all teams.

In this case, it works best to divide the task between two people, splitting the calculations in half, saving the journalist teams for last, since they require all the broadcast ratings forms in order to calculate their scores. At the end of the final calculations, round to the nearest integer. If there is enough time, double check one another's figures.

If there is a longer pause between the end of Phase Five and the Post-Game discussion, then you may wait until this period to calculate the results and prepare the summary for discussion.

POST-GAME DISCUSSION (30-50 minutes)

This is the heart of the learning experience. During the play of the game, if participants are engaged, they do not have much time or occasion to reflect on what is happening. Furthermore, if they play only one case, they have been viewing the world from the perspective of a particular team. The objective of the post-game discussion is to get them to step back and view the global system in a way that transcends the perspective of any particular team.

Timing of the Discussion

If circumstances permit, it is desirable to wait a day or more before holding this discussion rather than holding it immediately after having completed play. This delay allows the coordinators better to prepare for the discussion and allows those participants who are so inclined to reflect on the experience. This will also allow the coordinators to calculate the results in a less hurried manner.

Phases of Discussion

Written evaluations (10 minutes). Using the evaluation form provided in the Participant's Manual, please have participants fill out copies, collect them, and mail them to:

Bill Gamson, 5 Boston Hill Road, Chilmark, MA 05235. U.S.A.

Please include a copy of the Coordinator's Evaluation form included in this Manual.

The discussion can be divided as follows:

On the mechanics of the game:

- *** How easy or difficult was it to play?
- *** Were the materials confusing in any way?
- *** Was there too much to absorb in too little time?

Interpreting the results:

It is important that participants understand that their different team scores are not really comparable. If the WTO goes up seven points and the Government of Plantanoguary goes down three points, this does not indicate that the WTO played more skillfully than Plantanoguary. They have very different success indicators and obstacles to raising them. The meaningful comparison is with the scores of their team in other runs of the same scenario.

To prepare for this part of the discussion, the coordinator should visit the Community Forum on the website as described below. We have posted on the Community Forum, the Summary of Results of other trial runs of the same scenario. These are available for you to examine in preparing for the post-game discussion. You should take notes on interesting and typical results from other runs of the same scenario to share with participants. Once there are a sufficient number of runs of any given scenario, we will compile the range of scores for each of the teams, to be periodically updated as new results are posted. This will help participants to evaluate how their own scores compare.

Questions for discussion in this phase:

*** Does the summary of results contain any important omissions or errors?

*** Do you have any questions about what raised or lowered your team's overall success score?

*** How realistic does the game seem to you? (After the participants have had a chance to answer, the coordinators should be prepared to discuss what, in their judgment, is realistic and what is unrealistic. Where the model seems deficient in some regard, they should indicate how they would suggest changing it to increase its verisimilitude.)

Examining the Model.

Once you are reasonably confident that participants understand the content of the model, it is time for a critical look at the world it models. This may be done as part of the post-game discussion or in a separate session. Alternatively, you may wish to have participant's play the capstone case: Making a Better World, as a more concrete way of addressing these issues.

The question for discussion (or written work) becomes:

*** To the extent that the outcomes seem to be realistic, what would one have to change in the real world to produce different outcomes? (For example, change the accountability structure of the WTO in a specified way so that it is more responsive to the needs of the Global South.)

Community Forum

We need your cooperation in providing data for your own runs of the game. To post your Summary of Results, please follow the step by step instructions below:

Please visit the Global Justice Game website, located at: www.globaljusticegame.mrap.info and click on the Community Forum link. If you have not done so already, you will need to complete a quick and easy registration to use the forum. You can do so by clicking the “register” link located under the title. You will need to provide a valid e-mail address (preferably one which you use regularly). We do not share your e-mail address with anyone, and use it only to contact you with occasional Global Justice Game news, such as major updates.

Once you are registered, post a summary of your results, including the final scores, in the section titled “Results of Previous Games.” You will find separate discussion boards for each of the scenarios, each with sample posts on which you can base your post with your own results. Please remember to include the date when and location where you ran the scenario, and the name of the coordinator. With your results, we will soon be able to compile scores for your comparison.

The forum also provides boards for participants to further discuss with one another their experiences with the game, and a communal space in which coordinators can ask and answer questions about any aspect of the game, from simple logistics to sociological theory surrounding the game, so please encourage your participants to visit the forum and to use it as a supplement to the game. Think of the forum as you would any other community of peers, and be creative—unique input provides valuable insights for everyone who runs the game.

Scoring Sheets

For each team, there is a table that indicates the consequences of their own action choices and the action choices of other teams for their success indicators. The table also indicates the effects of media coverage on these indicators. The scoring sheets make explicit the model underlying the game and the assumptions on which it is based. Where the reasons for the particular values selected may not be clear, footnotes provide explanations. Making the assumptions explicit enables the coordinators to call into question the particular values attached. If a value seems too high or too low or even in the wrong direction, then the coordinators can change these values when calculating changes in the success indicators.

The teams are given a set of action options available to them but they are also encouraged to think of other actions that are not listed. They must check these additional actions with the coordinators for a ruling on whether they would be possible in the real world. The coordinators must be careful not to rule out an action because it is unlikely to be taken by the real world counterpart. The question is not whether the actor in the real world *would* take such an action but whether it *could*.

The Scoring Sheets contain question marks for the impact of unlisted actions on the team's success indicators. For such cases, the coordinators must supply the figures, making their best guess on how, for example, the price of a company's stock or its public reputation might be affected by the action taken. The values in the table for listed actions will provide guidelines for this judgment, allowing you to compare the unlisted action with the impact of those already specified. It is very helpful, at this point, for coordinators to be able to discuss these values briefly and to make a collective judgment as they compile final scores.

The coordinators should take notes on which actions were especially important in accounting for the rise and fall of particular indicators for the different players. This will be useful in preparing the Summary of Results.

The Scoring Sheets provide a final score for each of the teams on its relevant success indicators. They are useful for discussion but participants should understand that different teams do not face obstacles of equal difficulty. The real comparison is with how well the team which they played has scored in other runs of the game. This information is available in the community forum section of the game website.

Coordinator Evaluation Form

Date of Trial Run _____ Coordinator _____

Case _____

1. To what extent and in what ways did the game meet your objectives as a coordinator?

2. To what extent and in what ways did the game fail to meet your objectives or expectations?

3. Do you have any suggestions to improve the game in general without regard to any particular case?

4. Do you have any suggestions on how to make the particular scenario more effective?

5. Do you have any plans for using the Global Justice Game in the future?

Appendix: Going Bananas

The trade dispute over bananas is extremely complicated and the scenario used here simplifies it in a way that hopefully captures its essentials. This appendix describes the actual case (as of December, 2005), so that the coordinators can judge this for themselves and it provides enough detail so that you will be able to answer questions that arise in class on the dispute in the real world.

In 1975, shortly after the European Common Market was launched, the European countries signed a trade and aid agreement with 48 former European colonies in Africa, the Caribbean, and the Pacific (called the *ACP countries*). This agreement was called the Lomé Convention and established duty-free access to the European market for a range of commodities on which the ACP countries were extremely dependent. The “Banana Protocol” of the Lomé Convention gave a dozen or so ACP countries, mostly in the Caribbean, duty-free access to the European market for their bananas. The costs of producing these ACP bananas are often double that of bananas produced on large, mechanized plantations in Central and South America. The existence of the trade preferences allowed them to remain competitive.

In addition to importing ACP bananas, the European countries also import so-called “dollar bananas.” The countries that export dollar bananas are in Central and South America. The nickname comes from the fact that most of this production is controlled directly or indirectly by U.S.-based, multi-national companies – in particular, Chiquita, Dole, and Del Monte.

Before the Single European Market was launched in January, 1993, there were a series of different arrangements by individual European countries. With the launching of a market without national borders, it was necessary to have a single system and, after a lot of internal negotiation, the European Union set one up. This system, formally the Common Organization of the Market in Bananas (COMB), is commonly called the European banana regime. Under this system, ACP bananas are favored over dollar bananas. The ACP countries are given a quota under which they are allowed to export to Europe up to maximum of about 850 thousand tons of bananas duty-free. In contrast, dollar bananas have to pay a substantial tariff and are limited by the quota system in the volume they can export.

The U.S. companies that produced the dollar bananas were unhappy with this system and let the U.S. government know how they felt. Acting on their behalf, the U. S. government complained to GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) -- WTO's predecessor. GATT ruled in favor of the U.S. that aspects of the European banana regime were a violation of the trade agreement because they gave preferences to some GATT members and not others. However, GATT did not have the mechanism to force a change in the European system or to apply sanctions.

In 1996, after the WTO was established, the U.S. was joined by four Latin American countries in renewing the complaint against the European banana regime. The WTO's dispute settlement body established an expert panel to hold hearings on whether the policies being challenged were compatible or not with the basic rules of the WTO. This panel has made several rulings that have challenged aspects of the European banana regime and have led to various adjustments but these changes did not satisfy the countries filing the complaints.

In February 1999, the U.S. unilaterally announced retaliatory sanctions against a range of European products unrelated to bananas. Tariffs of 100% on entry into the U.S. market were levied on such items as decorative candles, cheeses, bath salts, and coffee makers. These U.S. sanctions were formally a violation of WTO regulations since they were made without WTO authorization. The WTO did authorize Ecuador to apply sanctions against European products of up to \$200 million a year. However, since most of Ecuador's European imports are basic foods needed by the population, imposing tariffs would have been self-defeating. Ecuador demanded that, in lieu of sanctions, they be given a larger quota in the banana regime.

In July 2001, a temporary compromise was reached. It kept in place the duty-free import of ACP bananas and a tariff for dollar bananas but reallocated quotas according to a complicated new system and shifted some of the ACP quota to dollar bananas. Most importantly, it promised to end the quota system entirely on January 1, 2006 and replace it with a tariff-only system.

The European Union proposal would end its system of quotas entirely, would keep ACP bananas duty-free, but would place a tariff on dollar bananas. A major issue is the size of the tariff. The new tariff adopted by the European Union more than doubles the current tariff from 75 Euros per metric ton to 176 Euros. This action is, in the view of the EU, a compromise. They originally proposed a tariff of 230 Euros but a WTO arbitrator ruled, in August, 2005, that a tariff at this level would not result in "at least maintaining access" for dollar bananas. The EU then presented a revised proposal of 187 Euros but this was also rejected by the WTO in October, 2005 on the same grounds. With the arbitration process over, the EU set the rate at 176 Euros. The countries affected by the tariff are not satisfied with this outcome and the dispute continues as of January 1, 2006.

Appendix : Example of a Summary of Results

Case: Race to the Bottom Results of Trial Run at Boston College (Matt Williams)

Date of trial run: November, 2005

Actions taken:

- The WTO ruled against the EU in the banana case, stating that the EU would be allowed to keep a tariff of 75 euros in place for the time being, but that they must phase it out over five years.
- The WTO also ruled against the EU in the beef case, authorizing the US to impose \$200 million in sanctions against the EU if the EU did not comply with their ruling.
- The EU refused to abide by either ruling. In the banana case, they instead maintained a tariff of 150 euros, pointing out that this is lower than their current one of 250 euros. They also maintained the ban on hormone-treated beef.
- In retaliation for the EU's noncompliance with the WTO, the State Department imposed \$200 million worth of sanctions on the EU.
- Annoyed with these upstart corporations getting governments to file WTO cases against the EU on their behalf, the EU revoked the corporate charters of HAZMAT and of Poquitia's European subsidiary. The EU argued that this would have a minimal impact on the European economy, since other companies in the same industries would absorb any resulting job losses. The EU, unfortunately, misjudged the matter. Other companies, in all industries, responded to what they saw as an arbitrary decision and a dangerous precedent with massive capital flight, pulling as many of their assets as they could out of Europe, devastating the economy and producing massive unemployment. Areas especially hard hit by job loss suffered from riots.
- HAZMAT conducted a public relations campaign to convince people that hormone-treated beef is safe.
- Poquitia also conducted a public relations campaign, explaining the evils of tariffs on dollar bananas.
- HAZMAT donated all their unused land in Plantanoguay to the government for the latter's land reform program. Although somewhat surprised by this unexpected generosity, the government of Plantanoguay happily accepted this donation of HAZMAT's land. While they left most of the land geared towards the production of bananas for export, they did shift a small amount to local, diversified crop production, as a move towards establishing food sovereignty.
- The PPM went on a tour of the US, promoting the idea of food sovereignty and the organization of producer cooperatives in the banana industry. This tour was supported by the government of Plantanoguay, CLR, the Interfaith Coalition, and RA-RA.
- CLR, the Interfaith Coalition, and RA-RA organized a joint anti-corporate campaign against HAZMAT, taking green zone actions.
- In response to this, HAZMAT filed SLAPP suits against the Interfaith Coalition, CLR, and RA-RA.

- The Interfaith Coalition and RA-RA joined the anti-WTO protests in Toronto, taking Green Zone actions. The CLR declined to take part, citing their approval of the WTO's ruling against the EU on the banana tariff question.

Scores (before/after media broadcasts):

WTO: 101/106. Global corporations approved of the WTO's ruling in both the banana tariff and the beef ban scenarios, though they would have preferred to see the banana tariffs wiped out immediately, rather than being phased out temporarily. Members of the Northern elite had mixed reactions to both rulings, depending on which countries they were from, since both cases pitted the US against the EU. Southern elites were indifferent to the beef case and had mixed reactions to the banana ruling, since it helped some of them and harmed others of them. Glowing mainstream media coverage considerably boosted the WTO's support among both global corporations and Northern elite, turning many European politicians against the EU leadership to solidify the WTO's support among Northern elites.

State Department: 103/106. The State Department's world power increased, thanks to the WTO's ruling in favor of it in both the banana and beef cases, though this was somewhat undermined by the EU's non-cooperation. These rulings had no affect on the State Department's electoral support one way or another, as most people didn't know enough about the cases to care about the rulings. Positive mainstream media coverage further bolstered the State Department's world power and influence and also generated some electoral support for its positions.

European Union: 90/91. The EU's employment rate and popular support were boosted slightly by its decision to maintain the banana tariffs, thus protecting the European banana industry. Its decision to maintain the ban of hormone-treated beef also boosted its popular support, given the popular opposition to such things among the European public. The WTO rulings against the EU on these matters, however, undermined popular support for the EU, as people questioned why it remained in the WTO as currently organized if it made such rulings. The EU's employment rate suffered from the trade sanctions imposed on it by the US. Its global equality index also went down slightly as a result of the WTO ordering it to phase out the banana tariffs. What really devastated the EU, however, was its decisions to revoke the corporate charters of HAZMAT and Poquita's European subsidiary. Other corporations reacted to what they saw as a dangerous and arbitrary precedent by engaging in massive capital flight. This sent the EU's unemployment rate through the roof and undermined its popular support as people saw their jobs vanishing, triggering rioting in especially hard hit areas. Positive coverage of the EU's actions from the Europress did much to eventually restore popular support for the EU's actions, turning the blame for the course of events elsewhere.

HAZMAT: 92/93. HAZMAT's price of stock was boosted slightly by the SLAPP suits they filed, since investors saw this as taking firm moves to deal with critics; this same move harmed their corporate reputation some. Their decision to donate their land in

Plantanoguay to the government's land reform program had the opposite effect, doing considerable good for their corporate reputation, but harming their price of stock considerably as well--not only did they loose valuable assets, but they gave them up voluntarily, which investors saw as the height of irrationality. HAZMAT's price of stock was further devastated by loosing their corporate charter in Belgium, where they were headquartered--although investors may have sympathized with HAZMAT's plight, the future of the corporation was clearly in jeopardy, not inspiring confidence among investors about its future profitability. Somewhat positive coverage from the mainstream press, particularly WUSA, further enhanced HAZMAT's corporate reputation.

Poquita: 98/99. Poquita boosted its price of stock and its corporate reputation through its public relations campaign. Its price of stock also went up in reaction to the WTO's decision to phase out banana tariffs, as investors anticipated a rise in future profits. Poquita's price of stock, however, was considerably harmed by the EU's decision to revoke the corporate charter of its EU subsidiary, thus crippling its ability to do business in Europe. It was not as severely harmed as HAZMAT though, since its headquarters are in the US, not Europe. Positive mainstream media coverage, particularly from WUSA, further enhanced Poquita's corporate reputation.

Plantanoguay: 105/108. Foreign investors were a little miffed with the donation of land to Plantanoguay by HAZMAT, since it made them wonder what sort of pressure Plantanoguay put on HAZMAT. (Most of their wrath, however, was saved for HAZMAT itself.) These foreign investors were, in any case, mollified by the decision to use most of the land for the production of bananas for export, which will bring foreign currency into Plantanoguay, better enabling it to pay of its foreign debts; they would have been somewhat happier if the government had left all of the land in banana production and not moved any of it to local crop production though. The government's popular support went up quite significantly in response to the land donation, since the government now seemed in a strong position to follow up on its promises of land reform and to pressure other companies to give land. The government also benefit in terms of popular support from the decision to make partial moves towards food sovereignty, its decision to sponsor the PPM's tour in the US, and the WTO ruling it ins favor on the banana dispute, since most Plantanoguayans saw this as a major world power finally getting sanctioned in a way that met their interests. The new land for the land reform program and the WTO ruling on the EU's tariffs also boosted Plantanoguay's prosperity rate slightly, since both of these created new jobs in banana production. Positive mainstream coverage gave the government of Plantanoguay solid standing with international investors, while good coverage from the Liberation Press further bolstered its popular support.

CLR: 102/106. The CLR contributed slightly to the advancement of labor rights worldwide by supporting the PPM's tour in the US. This move also boosted their popular support, as did the anti-corporate campaign against HAZMAT and the resulting alliances they built with the PPM, Interfaith Coalition, and RA-RA. On the other hand, their decision not to participate in the protests against the WTO hurt them with their constituency, who did not care that the WTO may have made one good ruling out of hundreds of bad ones--they still want to see the WTO reformed or dismantled. The SLAPP suit also hurt the CLR's popular support, as it tied up resources in fighting the court battle that could otherwise have gone into organizing and mobilizing their constituency. Mixed but generally positive coverage from the mainstream press and glowing coverage from the Liberation Press did much to boost CLR's popular support.

Interfaith Coalition: 103/106. The Interfaith Coalition boosted its popular support by helping to organize the PPM tour, participating in the anti-corporate campaign against HAZMAT and in the protests against the WTO. It also benefited from the resulting alliances they built with the PPM, CLR, and RA-RA. The SLAPP suit, however, hurt the Interfaith Coalition's popular support some, as it tied up resources in fighting the court battle that could otherwise have gone into organizing and mobilizing their constituency. Mixed coverage from mainstream sources had no affect on the Interfaith Coalition's score, but glowing coverage from the Liberation Press further boosted the Interfaith Coalition's popular support.

RA-RA: 103/106. RA-RA boosted its popular support by helping to organize the PPM tour, participating in the anti-corporate campaign against HAZMAT and in the protests against the WTO. It also benefited from the resulting alliances they built with the PPM, CLR, and Interfaith Coalition. The SLAPP suit, however, hurt RA-RA's popular support some, as it tied up resources in fighting the court battle that could otherwise have gone into organizing and mobilizing their constituency. Somewhat positive coverage from both mainstream and alternative sources further boosted RA-RA's popular support.

PPM: 105/105. The PPM's popular support was boosted considerably by the donation of HAZMAT's land to the government's land reform program, since many interpreted this as a result of successful pressure from the PPM. The PPM also gained in popular support from their North American speaking tour, and the government's move to devote some of the land from HAZMAT's donation to food sovereignty. Their regime stability index was also boosted by the donation of the land by HAZMAT, since this allows the government to follow through on their campaign promises of land reform and sets a precedent to pressure other corporations. The land donation also boosted equality in Plantanogway, as did the WTO ruling against EU tariffs on bananas, though the latter was offset by the EU's noncompliance with the WTO ruling. Mixed media coverage had no meaningful impact on the PPM's score.

WUSA: N-A/114. WUSA's broadcast bolstered their credibility with all sectors of the elite except the EU, giving them very high standing in the circles of power. Somewhat positive coverage of the social action groups gave them somewhat positive popular credibility.

Europress: N-A/111. The Europress' coverage gave them a solidly positive standing among most members of the global elite, though members of the corporate elite had more mixed feelings about their broadcast. Their broadcast received mixed reviews from social action groups, leaving it with no net impact on their score.

Liberation Press: N-A/107. Somewhat positive reviews from social action groups left the Liberation Press with a good deal of credibility in movement circles. Their colleagues in the mainstream media, on the other hand, were quite impressed with their broadcast.